



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,147	07/24/2006	Ryosuke Nishida	2006_1143A	4981
513 7590 03/29/2010 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503				
EXAMINER				
CORDRAY, DENNIS R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/29/2010		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com  
coa@wenderoth.com

Continuation sheet

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendments to claim 1, 3-9 and 12 now refer back to the method of claim 10 or 11, whereas previously none of the product claims referred back to these method claims, thus raising new issues requiring further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, applicant argues that paragraph 47 of the Specification discloses paper being impregnated. However, paragraph 47 recites "said aqueous liquid is impregnated with paper comprising inorganic fiber and pulp-shaped fiber previously manufactured by a common paper manufacturing method..." and continues to recite several impregnation methods. The language of the Specification fails to recite that the paper is impregnated as now claimed. Instead, the language supports the previously used claim language that was previously rejected as being indefinite. The rejection is maintained.

Regarding the rejections over cited prior art, applicant argues that Lorah et al does not teach the negative influence of cation exchange or how to prevent cation exchange. Applicant further argues that the Nishida and Tanaka et al references fail to teach that ion exchange of metal ions existing in water with the acidic group contained in the organic fine particles leads to a decrease in absorptive and desorptive properties of the paper.

Lorah et al was only used in an evidenciary capacity to teach that polymers containing acid groups are known to exchange cations readily. A teaching of the negative effects or means of preventing such exchange was not necessary.

Nishida et al '265 teaches that the carboxyl group of a potassium type expresses a high moisture absorbing property and that the object of the invention (absorbing-desorbing polymer) is best obtained when all carboxyl groups in the polymer are changed to a potassium type (col 3, line 65 to col 4, line 2; col 4, lines 26-30). This teaching along with the knowledge that polymers containing acid groups readily exchange cations (Lorah et al) provides sufficient motive to one of ordinary skill in the art to use water having as few non-potassium cations as possible.

The rejections over the cited prior art are maintained.